



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME LATIN ETYMOLOGIES.

BY J. B. GREENOUGH.

I.	<i>reciprocus</i>	<i>proceres</i>	<i>recipero</i>
	<i>procul</i>	<i>procum</i>	<i>recens</i>
	<i>Proculus</i>	<i>proximus</i>	
	<i>Proculeius</i>		
	<i>Procas</i>		

The word *reciprocus*, already analyzed by Corssen (Nachträge, p. 136) into a *dvandva* compound of †*recus* and †*procus*, has been treated also, without knowledge of Corssen's suggestion,¹ by Brugmann (Rhein. Mus. 1888, part 3, p. 402).

In both articles a supposed †*procus* (*pro* + *cus*, like *superbus*, *anticus*) is traced as appearing in *procul*, *Proculus*, *Proculeius*, and *Procas*. In the article of Brugmann it is traced also in *procum* (genitive plural), used by Cicero (*Or.* 46, 156) in connection with *fabrum*, apparently in the sense of *pioneers*. The writer presented at the meeting of the American Philological Association in July, 1887, the article here printed, with the same forgetfulness of the previous suggestion of Corssen. In that communication, in addition to the words previously connected with †*procus*, was mentioned *proximus*, which is at once seen upon the recognition of †*procus* to be its superlative (cf. *proximus ab*, showing the underlying idea of *off*). As a superlative it corresponds in form to *oxime*, superlative of *ociter*, adverb of a lost †*ocus*. The connection of meaning is recognizable through the double use of *procul* for *near by* and *far off*. The original meaning of that word was evidently *off*, or *in front*, as we say *off the coast*, meaning *just off*, *close by*, though the fundamental idea of our expression is one of separation. The idea of distance became the common one in *procul*, while the idea of nearness

¹ See note on last page of Rhein. Mus. cited.

is perpetuated in *proximus*. *Prope* is most likely a dialectic kindred form (cf. the construction *prope ab*, and for the form, *quisquam* and *quispiam*).

Procax, *forward*, *wanton*, seems a natural derivative, either directly or through a verb †*proco*. *Proceres* is a further formation of †*procus*, in the fashion of *Camurus*, *satur*, and *φοβερός*. One might be tempted to connect also *procērus*, whereby a natural derivation would be at once suggested for *sincerus* (cf. *singulī*).

No attempt has been made, however, to prove the existence of †*recus* in any other combination than *reciprocus*. But (to continue the original communication) we have the verb *recipero*, which obviously can have nothing to do with *recipio*, since there is no analogy for such a formation, and no form †*recipus* is probable. The word must be a denominative from †*reci-perus*, which can hardly be anything but †*recus* and *-parus*, as in *opi-parus*, *pro-perus* (and probably a lost †*imperus*, from which *impero*). The same *-parus* is found in the so-called derivatives from *pario*, *viviparus*, and the like.

The form †*recus* is also clearly recognizable as the source of a demonstrative †*receo*, of which the present participle is retained in *recens*, meaning *being back*, *coming back* (probably from abroad or the field, just as in our late war one might have said, "Colonel So-and-So is *back* for a few days"). It must be remembered that in the earlier period of the Latin language—the period when these words were forming—the Romans were absorbed in extending their boundaries. (Cf. *provincia*, No. 8, below.) From *being back* to *just back*, *fresh*, *recent*, the step is a very natural one.

This idea is strongly confirmed by the regular construction of *recens* with the ablative of the terminus *a quo*. This is so habitual that Cicero can say, *Roma recens*, meaning *just come from Rome*, where the persisting idea of motion plainly appears.

Thus, in support of †*recus* and †*procus*, we have nine words brought into line:—

- | | | |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|
| 1. <i>reciprocus</i> | 4. <i>proximus</i> | 7. <i>procax</i> |
| 2. <i>recipero</i> | 5. <i>procus</i> (in the sense of
foremost man) | 8. <i>Proculus</i> |
| 3. <i>recens</i> | 6. <i>proceres</i> | 9. <i>procul</i> |

A group which it seems impossible to disperse or overthrow.

2. *Improbus*.

The most various views have been held about the proper meaning of *improbus*; but no search for a Grundbegriff has ever seemed to me to be successful. The very great variety of words to which it is applied as an epithet makes it impossible to find any common element in them all. The attempt in Harper's Lexicon, for instance, to make it mean "not according to the standard," and so either *below* or *above*, seems to me extremely forced.

But a right conception of the meaning of *probus*, I think, gives the true solution of the difficulty. *Probus* can clearly be seen to be *pro* + *bus*, as *superbus*, and we may compare †*procus* and †*recus*, above referred to. The use of the word in Plautus, *proba merx*, and its probable occurrence on coins as *propom* and *prboum*, indicate that it was a mercantile word, meaning A 1 or first-class, and the like, a most natural meaning of *pro*, analogous to that of *super* in *superbus*.

To see the meaning of *improbus*, properly 'not first class,' we have only to notice the slang applications of *low down*, *ornery*, *second class*, *second rate*, *off color*, *bad lot*, and the like. In other words, *improbus* became, from its mercantile use, a slang word of abuse or disapproval, like *horrid*, *nasty*, *mean*, *awful*, *horrible*, without any definite idea attached to it. Take for instance *Georg.* I. 119, *improbus anser*. Here the tone of the passage is, except for the dignity of the subject, precisely that of the *nasty mice in the cupboard*. Again, in 145, *Labor omnia viciit improbus et duris urgens in rebus egestas*, the feeling is like *confounded* or *horrid*. So *Æn.* XII. 687, *fertur in abruptum mons improbus actu*, referring to *montis saxum*, described just before. There is no more definiteness of idea here than in "an everlastingly cold day."

3. *Rudimentum*.

Donaldson's *Varronianus* gives the true derivation of *rudimentum*, but it has apparently been forgotten, or is not generally known, for the word is usually referred loosely to *rudis*, *rough*, *raw*. But it must come from a (real or supposed) verb *rudio*, which could have no meaning as coming from *rudis*, *rough*, but which from *rudis*, *foil* or *stick*, would mean *fence with the foil*, the implement for sword practice in the gladiatorial school. *Rudimentum* is then *foil-practice*, the practice of the raw recruit, hence the first essays in war. It is to

be noticed that the word is constantly — perhaps oftener than in any other way — used of military service, as in *rudimenta militiæ* and the like. An adjective from the same *rudis*, *erudis*, would mean *out of the foil* (past preliminary practice), and *erudio* would be a natural denominative of it, meaning to train to that point of graduation. In this way the whole set of words is connected in a natural scheme of meanings.

4. *Desidero*.

The verb *desidero* ought to be formed from an adjective †*desīdes* (or *-er*), as *degenero* from *degener*. Such an adjective would be compounded from *de* and *sidus*. Another possible route is through the phrase *de sidere*, as with *extemporaneus* from *ex tempore*, *extraordinarius* from *extra ordinem*. *Sidus* from its form ought, like *sedes*, to mean *position, place*, being etymologically equivalent to *ἴδος*. It is very probable that this was its original meaning, but that the astronomical or augural meaning of constellation or *sign* crowded out the proper meaning which was itself retained by *sedes*. This (*sedes*), perhaps an original *i*-stem, was confounded with *sidus*, to some extent, in form, as we see by the nominative *-es*, which belongs to *s*-stems. The adjective †*desider*, or phrase *de sidere*, would mean ‘*out of place*,’ of soldiers missing at the call of the roll. From this, *desidero* would mean, ‘*find or mark out of place*,’ after a battle or military casualty. The word has a special use in military language in precisely this sense, — a use which could hardly come from the more common usage in other senses. Examples are numerous: —

Eo die milites sunt paulo minus septingenti desiderati. CAES. *B. G.* 7, 51.

In eo proelio non amplius ducentos milites desideravit sed centuriones fortes viros circiter triginta amisit. CAES. *B. C.* 3, 99.

One could almost think that in this last passage the original meaning comes to light, *desidero* being used of the soldiers, and *amitto* of the centurions.

On the other hand, the prevailing signification clearly points to some such origin, as it indicates a feeling of *loss* of something, a *missing* something, and only later, and much less commonly, corresponds to our desire in its weakest sense.

Considero may have had a similar origin from an adjective, †*con-sides* (or *-er*). But the meaning of the adjective is uncertain. It may have been an augural term like the †*contemplus* from which *contemplor* seems like a denominative. But it also may have been a military term like the other, and have meant merely dwelling on a thing, as is the case with *assiduus* (cf. *consido*).

5. *Elementum*.

A great deal of ingenuity has been expended in the effort to find a derivation for *elementum*. It seems to me, however, that the old one from *el em en*, which has been rejected as too simple and natural for science, is really the only one which ought to be thought of.

In the first place, throughout Latin literature, from first to last, the word means *A B C*'s, literally. This meaning, in the natural course of word-formation, it is almost impossible to derive from the more abstruse meaning of *means of growth*, or what not, which is often assumed for it; whereas, on the contrary, we have Lucretius' own authority (the first who used it, so far as appears in literature) for the change of meaning from letters to elements. In the first passage in which he uses the word at all, he says (I. 196) :—

Ut potius multis communia corpora rebus
Multa putes esse, ut verbis elementa videmus,
Quam sine principiis ullam rem existere posse.

Here we have only a comparison, and not a use of the word in the abstruse sense at all. In his technical names for the elements he has already used *primordia rerum* (as v. 182), which is unquestionably a translation of ἀρχαί. He has, it is true, used *semina, genitalia corpora, materies*, but evidently in a less technical sense, and not strictly as translations of the established terms in Greek. In I. 483, he uses *principia*, evidently another translation of ἀρχαί. Again, in v. 822, he says (repeated II. 688) :—

Quin etiam passim nostris in versibus ipsis
Multa elementa vides multis communia verbis,
Cum tamen inter se versus ac verba necessest
Confiteare et re et sonitu distare sonanti,
Tantum elementa queunt permutato ordine solo.

Again (in v. 912):—

. quo pacto verba quoque ipsa
Inter se paulo mutatis sunt elementis,
Cum ligna atque ignes distincta voce notemus.

In II. 981, speaking of his *primordia* or atoms, he says, using the word for the first time in the more remote sense:—

Ipsa quoque ex aliis debent constare elementis.

Meaning not his technical atoms, but component parts of them, as existing under a supposition which he rejects. At last, in III. 244, he uses *elementa* to express his technical atoms, and afterwards indiscriminately with the other words.

It is perhaps worth noticing that Lucretius in his list of names for the component parts of which he is going to treat, the *primordia rerum*, ἀρχαί (of other philosophers, perhaps), says (in I. 58):—

. . . quae nos (either the poet or his school) *materiam* et
genitalia corpora rebus
Reddunda in ratione vocare et *semina rerum*
Appellare suemus et haec eadem usurpare
Corpora prima.

The idea of calling them *elementa*, after the Greek, had apparently not occurred to him until after his conscious figure of the *A B C's* had accustomed his mind to that conception.

A still more striking indication of the meaning of *elementa* is found as late as B.C. 45, in Cic. *Acad.* I. 7, 26. Cicero says, Ergo illa (the four elements) initia et, ut e Graeco vertam, elementa dicuntur. Here *initia*, as representing ἀρχαί, is so natural that it does not seem like a translation to Cicero at all; whereas *elementa* distinctly represents not the idea itself, but the Greek στοιχεῖα. It seems to me inconceivable that if Cicero had felt any such meaning in *elementa*, as it must have had by derivation from any verbal root to which it could possibly be referred, he would have treated the word in this manner.

We may compare with this LUCILIUS, XXVIII. (Lachmann, 1876):—

. . . ἀρχαῖς hóminem et stoechiís simul
Privábit. Igni cúm et aqua interdixerit
Duo habét stoechia. . . .

i.e. he will be deprived of two elements, fire and water, but earth (his body) and air (his breath) will still be left to him.

This merely shows that *stoechia* was already in a manner in use in the language in its technical sense ready to be translated as soon as a more patriotic *Sprachgefühl* should suggest that course.

Inasmuch, then, as *elementa* is distinctly a translation of στοιχεῖα, it seems almost certain that it had the meaning of *A B C's*, and not any other more abstruse meaning. As to the form, it must, it seems to me, be for *el-em-ena*, a plural like *A B C's*. As the tendency in the language increased to substitute the longer forms in *-mentum* for those in *-men* (as in *momen*, *momentum*), this word also went with the rest, and became *elementa* in the same meaning. The only objection that can be made is the fact that these letters are not the first of the alphabet. But they are the most glib and easy in their utterance; and though we have no example of the same kind in regard to letters, yet, as has been suggested by a friend, we do have Solfeggio and sol-fa-ing, of precisely the same nature, and chosen for precisely the same reason.

It would seem, then, that we might rest contented with the old-fashioned and simple derivation of *elementum*, without wasting any more lore of Indo-European roots on it.

6. *Praemium*.

A natural derivation of *praemium* has occurred to me which I have not seen suggested.

Among the Romans, booty taken in war was under the control of the commander-in-chief. As an instance, we may take APPIAN, *de Bell. Mithr.* 116:—

Διέδωκεν ὁ Πομπήιος ἀριστεία τῷ στρατῷ καθ' ἕκαστον ἄνδρα χιλίας πεντακοσίας Ἀττικὰς κ.τ.λ.

It could be given to the soldiers in whole or in part, and what was not so disposed of was sold at auction for the benefit of the State. Though the part distributed to the soldiers was regularly divided among them, yet special donations were often made as rewards for good conduct. See PLUTARCH, *Coriolanus*, 10:—

Ἐπειτα πολλῶν χρημάτων καὶ ἵππων γεγονότων αἰχμαλώτων καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐκέλευσεν [Cominius, the consul] αὐτὸν [Coriolanus] ἐξελεσθαι δέκα πάντα πρὸ τοῦ νέμειν τοῖς ἄλλοις.

A similar custom is referred to in PLAUT. *Amphitruo*, 534, when Jupiter (as Amphitryon) says : —

[∟ ∪] hanc paterám quae dono mi illi ob virtutém datast,
Ptérela rex qui pótitavit, quem égo mea occidí manu.

Another appropriation is mentioned in Cíc. *pro Archia*, X. 25 : —

Quem (Sulla) nos in contione vidimus cum libellum malus poeta in eum fecisset . . . statim ex eis rebus quas tunc vendebat iubere ei praeium tribui.

Such special parts of the spoil would naturally be *prae-emia* (*emo* in its earlier meaning of *take*), *taken out beforehand*; cf. *eximius*.

From such a custom the word might easily have come to mean a prize or reward, generally.

7. *deliciae, delicatus*.

To the above may be added the words *deliciae* and *delicatus*, not included in the original paper. If the ordinary analogies are followed in these words, they both lead us alike to an adjective, *delicus*, *de + licus*, like *re-liquus*: whence, on the one hand, *deliciae*, like *reliquiae, angustiae, infitiae (infittas ire), exsequiae*; and on the other, to a denominative †*delico*, whose participle would be *delicatus*. Now, this word *delicus* is actually found in Varro in the sense of a pig weaned by its mother: *Cum porci depulsi sunt a mamma a quibusdam delici appellantur neque iam lactentes dicuntur*. R. R. 4.

There is perhaps no direct evidence that the word was used of lambs or kids, but there seems no reason why it should not have been used of any animal in that situation. That it was the ancient custom to bring up such at home seems hardly to need any proof. We know the ancients had pet lambs and kids. (See ZOEGA, *Bassirelievi*, I, pl. xxv., where a kid appears among other instruments of childish joys; also MONTFAUCON, *Antiquités*, v. 37.) Such animals are petted and pampered, as appears by our own use of *cosset* in the sense of *pamper*. Nothing is more natural than that a verb *delico* should be formed meaning to *pet, pamper, and cosset*.

Though this verb does not appear, it is reflected in *delicatus*, as in VIRG. *Catalect.* 2, 10: *meis capella delicata pascuis*; or again, in CATULLUS 17, 15: *puella tenellulo delicatior haedo*, where again the original association of the word shows through.

This adjective or participle has evidently the meaning of *tender* in the sense in which tenderness comes from pampering and coddling.

The noun *deliciae* is a natural abstract like *reliquiae*, and would mean *pettings*; hence, *habere in deliciis*, *esse in amore et deliciis*: but later also, *in deliciis et delectamentis*.

From this meaning the transition is easy to *pet*, *object of fancy*, *delight*, which is the prevailing meaning of the word. Hence, the word is often used of animals and children, without any bad sense such as might indicate a connection with *lacio*. So also *delicium* is used in the same sense. The development of form and meaning is the same as in *reliquus*, *reliquiae*; *angustus*, *angustiae*.

It is probable that the Romans themselves connected these two words with *lacio*, *allicio*, *pellicio*, *delecto*; but it seems impossible to develop either form or meaning from this group in any natural manner.

8. *provincia*.

The word *provincia*, like many other Latin words which received their stamp before the literary period, has given great trouble to etymologists, from Festus down. It has almost always been referred to *pro-vinco*, but with what connection of ideas? Where the word first occurs in literature it has almost as wide a meaning as the word *province* in English. So marked is this figurative use that many persons have refused to adopt the idea of a military origin for the word at all. It seems to me that the difficulty has been that attention has not been paid to the regular development of the word through the intermediate stages of its formation and growth. If we look merely at the form, it almost inevitably suggests a †*provincus*. In no other way does it seem possible for it to be formed.

There are, it is true, a few examples of supposed primary formations with *-io*, like *eximius* in Latin. But there is no certain instance of a form in *-ia* derived in this manner. The abstracts in *-ia* are separated from these formations, from the earliest Indo-European times, by the accent. They may possibly be really feminines of the *-io* formation; but if so, they received their special functions farther back than the Indo-European language can be traced, and must be quite distinct from such words as *exsequiae*, *indutiae*, *inferiae*, *reli-*

quiae, if we suppose these to be primary, which is by no means certain. In fact, such forms as *reliquiae*, *deliciae*, *angustiae*, *insidiae*, are certainly secondary, as are probably also *excubiae*, *indutiae*, *exsequiae* and *infittiae*. *Inferiae*, the only troublesome word of this class, is too uncertain in its origin to serve as the basis of any argument. The only noun of the abstract class that looks like a primary in *-ia* is *inedia*; but this, on account of its negative, almost necessarily implies an †*inedus* (or *-is*), as *incuria* implies an adjective formed from *in* and *cura*.

It is not essential, however, that there should have been an actual †*provincus*, only that *provincia* should have been formed as if there had been one.

Now, supposing a †*provincus*, either real or imagined by the Romans, what would it mean? As almost all are agreed in regard to the principal word, we can look only to *pro* and *vinco*. The *n*, though irregular, is paralleled by *vinca pervinca*, a persistent weed, *pervenche*, *periwinkle*, and the same influence of the present stem is seen in *coniunx*, *finxi*, *nactus*.

Mommsen, in his discussion of the technical meaning of the word *provincia* (*Rechtsfrage*, etc., p. 4), connects it with *provinco* without assuming or explaining any intermediate †*provincus*. He assigns to the word the etymological meaning of *Kriegs- oder Commandobereich*. But that he had no definite idea of the development of the word appears from his statements in regard to it in his *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vol. I. p. 50, where he makes the *pro* refer to the march apart of the two consuls, a notion which few will be inclined to accept. He also lays stress on the supposed fact that no one consul can have a province, but only when there are two expeditions abroad can there be provinces at all. This can hardly be true, for often a single province is spoken of where the other consul remained at home, as in Liv. IV. 37 and 43; VII. 6 and 38. Both consuls also are occasionally spoken of as present in one province, though, of course, in this case there could not be the usual allotment. We may compare the narrative of the year B.C. 465, Liv. III. 2:—

Fabio extra ordinem quia is victor pacem Aequis dederat ea provincia data. . . . Quae ubi Romam sunt nuntiata indignitas rei . . . consulem alterum ab urbe excivit.

So also B.C. 464, LIV. III. 4 : —

Sp. Furius consulum alter cui ea provincia evenerat, *etc.*
ut Postumio alteri consulum negotium daretur videret ne quid res-
publica detrimenti caperet, *etc.*

To complete Mommsen's view, we may add his remark in *R. G.*
1², p. 247, note : —

Provincia ist bekanntlich in der älteren Sprache nicht was wir Provinz nennen, ein räumlich abgegrenzter einem ständigen Oberbeamten unterstellter Sprengel, sondern lediglich die durch Gesetz, Senatsbeschluss oder Vertrag den einzelnen Beamten festgestellte Competenz.

Here, however, he is only speaking of the distinction between the provinces beyond sea in the later technical sense of the word as opposed to the earlier use of the word before these foreign governments were established. His view in general is like the one here maintained, except in regard to the meaning of *pro* in the compound.

The various other suggestions of the origin of the word, apart from *vinco*, seem forced, and have never received any general approval. They need not therefore be discussed here.

The difficulties all vanish, it seems to me, as soon as a real †*provincus* is assumed, meaning "engaged in advancing conquest." It might be applied to an army, or especially to a consul or general, when engaged, as these officers were every summer in early times, in extending the bounds of the Roman power. How important a function this was, and how large a place it filled in the Roman mind, appears from the constant use of *propagare finis* and the religious idea, which must be very old, that only such *imperatores* as had extended the bounds of the Empire were entitled to enlarge the *pomœrium*.

If, now, a consul were out conquering the territory of a neighboring tribe, he would be †*provincus*, and his state or condition would be *provincia*. He would be 'engaged at the front,' he would 'go to the front'; 'the action at the front would be assigned to him' or the like. Later the word would become concrete, as did abstract nouns generally in Latin, and a particular *provincia* or 'sphere of operations at the front' would fall to his lot. The word must have been long in use in this sense, and have continued to have that feeling attached to

it until very late, to make it possible for the figurative use to develop as we meet it in the earliest literature, and at the same time to make it seem natural to call Sicily, for instance, a *province* in the later technical sense. The word *vincia*, cited by Festus, is probably only invented by him to account for *provincia*. If it really ever existed, it would be a similar abstract from †*vincus*, and would mean 'the act or state of conquest,' 'actual operations,' or the like. It might just as well have come to mean what the other did, only it failed to take root in the language, if it ever was there at all.

The strongest confirmation of this view comes from the use of the word by Livy in the distinct sense of 'actual seat of war' or 'definite field of operations,'—a sense entirely distinct from the abstract meaning of 'function or scope of operations or thing to be done.' *E.g.*:—

hic in provincia consulatū inire consilium erat (*i.e.* at Ariminum, then the seat of operations against Hannibal). Liv. XXI. 63.

ut explorarent . . . qua provincia nostra qua hostium foret. Liv. XLIV. 18.

In the latter passage the word has a distinct territorial sense, entirely different from its technical use, and seems to recall an earlier use still remaining in the annalists from whom Livy is copying.

So Samnium Camillo sorte evenit. VIII. 29. Cui Campania sorte provincia evenerat. VII. 38. Consules partiti provincias. Etruria Decio Samnium Fabio evenit. IX. 41.

It is not without significance, too, that the regular way of expressing the provinces in the earlier sense is by the names of nations, which are probably to be taken in the territorial sense in which such names are used so often in Latin. *E.g.* Valerio Potito Volsci provincia evenerat. Liv. V. 12; and so *passim*.

Livy varies between *Samnium* and *Samnites* in this use.

The subsequent development of meaning would be easy and natural. Until the institution of the office of praetor, B.C. 367, the word would perhaps not be required, except in its original military sense. But before that there were often situations which would suggest its extension. Cf. Consules inde partiti provincias. Fabio ut legiones Antium duceret datum, Cornelius ut Romae praesidio esset. Liv. III. 22. 3. Sp. Furius consulum alter cui ea provincia evenerat profectus in Aequeos, *etc.* ut Postumio alteri consulum negotium

daretur videret ne quid, etc., with the usual martial law formula. Liv. III. 4 (above cited).

So also when six tribunes with consular power were chosen : Corneliis Faliscum bellum Valerio ac Servilio Capenas sorte evenit (the other two remaining at home). Liv. IV. 24.

From the time of the establishment of an independent judiciary the way would be open to an extension of the meaning to functions not military. From the fondness of the Romans for official words the meaning of *provincia* would naturally extend itself so as to include any sphere of activity or set of functions, while at the same time the word in its official sense would continue to be used and develop the narrower technical sense of a special government beyond sea.